DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 053 TM 850 528

AUTHOR	Duncan, Andrew Neill
TITLE	An Assessment of Formal Teacher Evaluation Practices in Alberta (Summary).
INSTITUTION	Lakeland School District #5460 (Alberta).
SPONS AGENCY	Alberta Dept. of Education, Edmonton. Planning Services Branch.
PUB DATE	Dec 84
NOTE	36p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Beginning Teachers; *Educational Policy; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluators; Foreign Countries; Principals; Questionnaires; Research Needs; *School Policy; Secondary School Teachers; State Departments of Education; *State Standards; State Surveys; Superintendents; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Alberta; Mail Surveys

ABSTRACT

To assess the impact of the 1984 Alberta Education teacher evaluation policy, this study investigated the formal teacher evaluation practices of superintendents, other central office staff, and principals in Alberta (Canada) in 1983-84. A three part, mailed questionnaire based on existing instruments collected: (1) demographic data on the responding evaluator; (2) data related to initiating factors, purposes, and outcomes of their last teacher evaluation; and (3) data on the evaluation procedures used. Experts in "due process" and "improvement of instruction" adjudicated items in part three to establish minimum criteria for satisfactory evaluation. Respondents placed high priority on teacher evaluation, but had inadequate time. Less than half strictly followed Board policy. Two-thirds gave positive ratings to the last teacher evaluated. Most teachers were retained, received permanent contracts, or were recommended for permanent certification. Very few respondents (4.5 percent) met the minimum criteria to assure due process, and fewer (1.3 percent) met instructional improvement criteria. No relationship was found between the presence of a written, formal teacher evaluation policy or the level of adherence to policy and the completeness of the evaluation. Recommendations to school boards included hiring qualified evaluators, inservice training to upgrade current evaluators, and government legislation to ensure fair and consistent teacher evaluation. (Author/BS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262053

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The Eric Facility has assigned this document for proccesing to:
TM
In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view

Teacher Evaluation Practices in Alberta

Summary Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Hastings, H. I.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Planning Services

TM 850 528

Alberta
EDUCATION

AN ASSESSMENT OF FORMAL TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES IN ALBERTA

(SUMMARY)

ANDREW NEILL DUNCAN

LAKELAND (PUBLIC) SCHOOL DISTRICT #5460

Under Contract to Alberta Education, Edmonton, Alberta

December 1984

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A study such as this cannot be completed alone and sincere thanks are due to those who provided help and guidance along the way.

To the Board of Trustees of the Lakeland School District #5460 for encouraging and sponsoring the research and to Superintendent Gary Kiernan for his advice and support;

To the superintendents, central office staff, principals, teachers, and others who responded to the survey--we couldn't have done it without you;

To Andy Birchill, Superintendent of Schools in Wainwright who planted the seed of the idea;

To Rose Panas, Belle Foley, and particularly Pat Richie, who typed and retyped (ad nauseam) the questionnaires and early drafts; and Susan Fagan who typed and edited the final draft;

To Phil Davidson of the University of Alberta who helped me survive the "number crunching" stage.

To Dr. Clarence Rhodes and Dr. David Townsend of Alberta Education for their invaluable advice;

--and particularly to:

Dr. Robert Sylwester of the University of Oregon, a friend and mentor whose sound advice, caring and understanding carried this study from concept to reality.

Lakeland School District #5460

Board of Trustees

Hansa Thaleshvar

Ted Bodner

Judy Cabay

George Amalia

Roberta Daniels

Rick Engler

Ruth Piper

Lyn Patterson

Superintendent

Gary Kiernan

Secretary Treasurer

Charles Gault

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
THE LITERATURE	2
THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY	4
FINDINGS	5
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	17
Demographic Factors	17
Inservice Training	18
Policy	19
Mimimum Criteria for Satisfactory Evaluation	22
RECOMMENDATIONS	23
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	24
REFERENCES	26

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Primary Condition Involved in Initiating the Last Formal Teacher Evaluation.....	9
2.	Primary Intended Purpose of the Last Formal Evaluation.....	10
3.	Outcome of the Last Formal Teacher Evaluation.....	11
4.	Experts' Ratings of Items on the Modified Acheson/Shinn Instrument.....	13
5.	Comparative Ranking of "Yes" Responses to Items on the Acheson/Shinn Instrument.....	15

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the formal teacher evaluation practices of superintendents, other central office staff, and principals.

A questionnaire collected data on their evaluation practices between September 1983 and April 1984: (1) demographic data on the responding evaluator; (2) data related to initiating factors, purposes, and outcomes of their last teacher evaluation; and (3) data on the evaluative procedures they used in that evaluation.

Experts in "due process" and "improvement of instruction" adjudicated items in part 3 to establish minimum criteria for satisfactory evaluation.

Respondents generally placed a high priority on teacher evaluation, but had inadequate time.

Less than half of the respondents followed board policy "strictly to the letter." Two-thirds of the respondents gave a positive rating to the last teacher evaluated.

Of the teachers evaluated, 60.8% were tenured, and 39.2% were first year teachers, or new to the school/system. Junior high teachers comprised the largest group evaluated, and language arts and math were the subjects most observed.

The majority of evaluations were initiated as routine evaluations, with primary purposes to: improve the teacher's performance, award a permanent contract, provide a

basis for retention in position, or recommend permanent certification. As a result, most teachers were retained in their present position, received a permanent contract, or were recommended for permanent certification.

Very few of the respondents (4.5%) met the minimum criteria to assure due process and fewer (1.3%) met the criteria for improvement of instruction.

The completeness of the evaluation (i.e., score on part 3 of the questionnaire) correlated positively with time spent in classroom observation, number of observation visits, priority of teacher evaluation, and number of related university courses.

Where the purpose or outcome of the evaluation related to inservice needs, the completeness of the evaluation correlated positively with the purpose or outcome.

Where the purpose or outcome of the evaluation related to a recommendation for permanent certification, the completeness of the evaluation correlated negatively with the purpose or outcome.

No relationship was found between the presence of a written policy on formal teacher evaluation and the completeness of the evaluation, nor was the level of adherence to policy significantly related to completeness.

SUMMARY

Introduction

The case of James Keegstra (Keegstra v. County of Lacombe, 1983), who was dismissed from his teaching position, rekindled public and political interest in the evaluation of teachers. This renewed interest contributed to the development, in 1984, of a teacher evaluation policy by Alberta Education. In essence, this policy requires that Alberta school jurisdictions put into place fair and consistent board policies to assure the regular evaluation of teachers for the purposes of (1) assisting in the professional development of teachers, and (2) taking appropriate action with respect to teachers whose performance is unacceptable.

This study provides benchmark data for assessing the impact of the Alberta Education policy, and information to stakeholder groups on current practices and the minimum criteria to be met for satisfactory teacher evaluation.

The primary purpose of this study was to describe the state of formal teacher evaluation in Alberta in the 1983-84 school year. The specific aims were:

1. To collect demographic information about the evaluators and teachers involved in formal teacher evaluation in Alberta.

2. To describe the initiating factors, intended purposes and outcomes of formal teacher evaluation.
3. To describe the procedures used by evaluators in formally evaluating teachers.
4. To analyze the quality of teacher evaluation procedures with respect to minimum requirements to improve instruction and to assure due process.
5. To identify the relationships between selected demographic factors and the completeness of the evaluation.

The Literature

The literature related to teacher evaluation is extensive, diverse, and sometimes contradictory. The review of the literature for this study traced the development of evaluation from its beginnings as an inspectoral, autocratic process (Burton & Brueckner 1955), through the "scientific" and "democratic" models of the early twentieth century (Lucio & McNeil, 1962; Wiles & Lovell, 1967); to the multigoal, democratic interactive process exemplified by Acheson's (1982) model of the clinical supervision process.

The literature identifies a great many purposes for teacher evaluation, but they can all be incorporated into two major categories, namely purposes related to the improvement of the teacher's instructional performance, and purposes involving judgemental functions related to decision

making and teacher competency.

The profound impact of the evaluation of teachers on student learning is dealt with in some early literature (Burton, 1922; Barr, Burton & Breuckner, 1938), but more recent research (e.g., Amidon & Flanders, 1963; Berliner, 1982; Hersh, 1981; Medley & Crook, 1982) has focussed upon teaching behaviors rather than student outcomes. Much of this research is ambiguous or contradictory, and the effectiveness of any given approach is often dependent upon the particular goals of education for the given situation.

In recent years a number of models of teacher evaluation have been developed which involve the establishment of goals and some level of teacher input. The Manatt "Mutual Benefit Evaluation" (Manatt, Palmer & Hibblebaugh, 1976), and Redfern's (1980) "Management by Objectives" models are examples. The flexible, multigoal model which has achieved prominence today is the "Clinical Supervision" model initially developed by Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973).

Teacher evaluation in Alberta is the subject of a great many opinion articles but few research studies. The studies have tended to focus upon the superintendent's perception of the policies and practices prevalent in their jurisdiction; however, one recent study (Townsend, 1984) documented the process of implementation of a new policy on teacher supervision and evaluation, and demonstrated that high

levels of acceptance, participation, and satisfaction with the process can be attained through appropriate implementation strategies.

The dearth of research on teacher evaluation in Alberta illustrates the need for more information on current practices, particularly with respect to improvement of instruction and due process criteria, namely, those processes common to the clinical supervision model.

The Design of the Study

To assess the state of formal teacher evaluation in Alberta, the following steps were taken:

1. A three part questionnaire, based upon existing instruments, was developed. Section one collected demographic data about the responding evaluator. Section two addressed the "last formal teacher evaluation carried out," and collected data related to the initiating factors, purposes, and outcomes of that evaluation. Section three, the Modified Acheson/Shinn instrument, collected data on the supervisory practices used in the last formal teacher evaluation.

2. The questionnaire was administered to a study group consisting of all Alberta superintendents, all other central office staff who were members of the Conference of Alberta School Superintendents as of December 1983, and a 25% sample of Alberta school principals.

3. Minimum criteria for satisfactory evaluation in the areas of "due process" and "improvement of instruction" were established by submitting Section 3 of the questionnaire, the Modified Acheson/Shinn instrument, to experts for adjudication. Teacher perceptions of appropriate evaluation strategies were assessed by administering the Modified Acheson/Shinn instrument to a sample of teachers.

4. Data from the questionnaires were processed using the SPSSX Sprint package. Frequency distributions and means were generated for all variables. Ratings by experts and teachers of the 37 items on the Modified Acheson/Shinn instrument were summed and averaged and three subsets delineating the minimum criteria for satisfactory evaluation in the areas of due process, improvement of instruction, and teacher perception were generated. Demographic factors were described and the relationships between the demographic variables and the scores on the Modified Acheson/Shinn instrument and its subsets were examined.

Findings

Five hundred and sixty six questionnaires were sent to superintendents, other central office staff, and principals, and a total of 484 usable replies were received, resulting in an 85.5% return rate for the group. Of the 106 superintendents surveyed, 99 (93.4%) returned usable responses, other central office staff returned 97 (85.8%) of

the 116 questionnaires sent to them, and principals responded by returning 288 (83.3%) of the 347 questionnaires sent out.

The findings were as follows:

1. On average, superintendents had 13.8 years experience in teacher evaluation, had undertaken 1.87 university courses related to teacher evaluation, and had engaged in 18.5 hours of related inservice training in the last five years. By comparison, other central office staff had 11.4 years experience, 1.76 university courses, and 23.4 hours of inservice training. Principals averaged 9.3 years experience, had taken 1.0 university courses, and 14.9 hours of inservice training.

2. Not all respondents were involved in teacher evaluation during the study period but 71.7% of superintendents, 67% of other central office staff, and 73.3% of principals reported that they had evaluated one or more teachers. Of the respondents who did evaluate teachers, superintendents averaged 20.8 teachers, other central office staff, 25.1 teachers and principals, 8.7 teachers.

3. During the study period, respondents reported a total of 4,924 evaluations performed. Of these, superintendents did 29.5%, other central office staff did 33.1%, and principals did 37.3%. Of the evaluations performed, 21.9% were of first year teachers, 17.3% were of

experienced teachers new to the school/system, and 60.8% were of tenured teachers.

4. Respondents, especially superintendents, generally rated teacher evaluation as a high priority item in relation to all their other duties, but most respondents considered the time available to be inadequate. Respondents who rated teacher evaluation as a high priority scored significantly higher on the Modified Acheson/Shinn instrument, the measure of the completeness of the evaluation; however, the perceived amount of time available had no significant impact on the completeness of the evaluation.

5. Over 80% of respondents indicated that their jurisdiction had a written policy on formal teacher evaluation, but less than 50% of the respondents who evaluated teachers followed the policy "strictly to the letter." Neither the presence of policy, nor the degree to which it was followed, showed any significant relationship to the completeness of the evaluation.

6. Over 80% of respondents made two or more classroom visits during the last formal teacher evaluation, and the average time spent in classroom observation was over two hours. Junior high teachers comprised the largest group of teachers evaluated and language arts and math were the subjects most commonly observed. Respondents who made more classroom visits or spent more time in classroom observation during the last formal teacher evaluation scored

significantly higher on the completeness measure than those who visited less often, or spent less time in observation. The grade level and subject observed (except science) was not significantly related to the completeness of the evaluation.

7. The majority of the last formal teacher evaluations carried out by the study group were initiated (Table 1) as routine evaluations according to school board policy. Their primary purposes (Table 2) were: to improve the performance of the teacher, to award a permanent contract, to provide a basis for retention in position, or to recommend for permanent certification. As a result of the evaluation (Table 3), most teachers were retained in their present position, received a permanent contract or were recommended for permanent certification. Teacher dismissal was cited as a primary purpose of the evaluation by 4.1% of respondents and was reported as an outcome of the evaluation by 4.8% of respondents. Formal teacher evaluation was rarely used as a basis for transfer or promotion.

8. When the evaluation was initiated as a routine evaluation according to district policy, respondents scored significantly higher on the completeness measure than when they did not. Other initiating factors were not significant in affecting the completeness of the evaluation.

When the primary intended purpose of the last formal evaluation was to improve the performance of the teacher, or

TABLE 1. Primary Condition Involved in Initiating the Last Formal Teacher Evaluation

Initiating Factor	Percentage of Responses		
	S	O	P *
N =	(82)	(73)	(231)
District policy: Routine evaluation	57.3%	60.3%	66.7%
Need for documentation	17.1%	13.7%	11.7%
Teacher request	9.8%	9.6%	5.6%
Concerns after informal observations	7.3%	5.5%	6.5%
Parental complaint	3.7%	6.8%	5.2%
Other	4.9%	4.1%	4.3%

* S = Superintendents
O = Other Central Office Staff
P = Principals

TABLE 2. Primary Intended Purpose of the Last Formal Evaluation

Primary Intended Purpose	Percentage of Responses		
	S	O	P *
N =	(88)	(77)	(259)
Improving performance of teacher	19.3%	31.2%	29.3%
Awarding a permanent contract	26.1%	28.6%	12.7%
Basis for retention in position	19.3%	13.0%	13.9%
Recommending permanent certification	14.8%	7.8%	10.4%
Determining inservice needs	5.7%	5.2%	7.7%
Basis for dismissal	5.7%	7.8%	2.3%
Basis for transfer	1.1%	0%	3.5%
Recording the performance of a resigning/retiring teacher	1.1%	1.3%	1.9%
Basis for promotion	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%
Other	5.7%	5.2%	17.0%

* S = Superintendents
O = Other Central Office Staff
P = Principals

TABLE 3. Outcome of the Last Formal Teacher Evaluation

Outcome of the Evaluation The teacher was/will:	N =	Percentage of Responses S (87)	 O (87)	 P * (258)
continue in present position		35.6%	36.7%	45.7%
receive a permanent contract		20.7%	20.7%	11.2%
be recommended for permanent certification		14.9%	8.0%	12.4%
assisted with an inservice plan		4.6%	14.9%	10.1%
dismissed		9.0%	4.6%	3.5%
seen by another evaluator		4.6%	4.6%	4.7%
promoted		0%	3.4%	1.6%
challenge the evaluation report		0%	1.1%	0.8%
Other		10.3%	5.7%	10.1%

* S = Superintendents
O = Other Central Office Staff
P = Principals

to record the performance of a resigning or retiring teacher, respondents scored significantly higher on the completeness measure than when it was not. When the purpose was to recommend for permanent certification, respondents scored significantly lower on the completeness measure. Other intended purposes did not significantly influence the respondents' score on the completeness measure.

When, as a result of the evaluation, an inservice plan was developed for the teacher, respondents scored higher on the completeness measure than when no plan was developed. If the teacher was recommended for permanent certification as a result of the evaluation, the respondents scored significantly lower on the completeness measure.

9. Experts identified 17 of the 37 items on the Modified Acheson/Shinn instrument as essential to assuring due process in formal teacher evaluation (Table 4). In essence, the items related to due process suggest that: (i) standards of performance must be developed for the teacher, (ii) a variety of objective data must be collected, (iii) a post conference must be held with the teacher to discuss the data and develop recommendations for improvement, (iv) a plan of assistance must be developed for the teacher, and (v) the teacher must be given a copy of the evaluation report and the opportunity to respond in writing.

Experts in improvement of instruction identified 25 of the Modified Acheson/Shinn items as essential (Table 4). In

TABLE 4. Experts' Ratings of Items on the Modified Acheson/Shinn Instrument

Item #	Descriptor	I	P	T*
25	Met with teacher after observation	1.00	1.00	1.16
20	Observed for at least 30 minutes	1.00	1.00	1.43
35	Teacher received a copy of report	1.13	1.33	1.10
32	Developed recommendations	1.50	1.00	1.39
34	Developed a plan of assistance	1.50	1.00	1.47
36	Teacher could respond in writing	1.13	1.66	1.32
33	Developed recommendations with teacher	1.25	1.66	1.23
37	Appeal procedure available	1.00	2.00	1.23
26	Solicited teacher analysis of data	1.50	1.66	1.29
31	Recommended resources	1.50	1.66	1.45
30	Gave praise and encouragement	1.25	2.33	1.32
27	Encouraged teacher inferences & opinions	1.38	2.33	1.19
28	Encouraged consideration of alternatives	1.29	2.00	1.71
22	Compared with Alberta Program of Studies	1.75	1.33	2.03
24	Examined student work	1.63	1.66	1.87
2	Standards of performance developed	1.57	1.66	2.00
3	Met prior to observation	1.75	2.00	1.52
12	Recorded data on on-task behavior	1.75	1.66	2.00
10	Recorded data on teacher questions	1.75	1.66	2.03
21	Examined teacher's planbook	1.63	1.66	2.19
5	Found teacher concerns	1.38	2.66	1.52
1	Had written job description	1.80	2.00	1.76
11	Recorded data on student responses	1.75	1.66	2.30
4	Found teacher expectations of students	1.75	2.50	1.48
29	Listened more than I talked	1.43	2.66	1.87
23	Examined record of student achievement	2.13	1.66	2.19
13	Recorded data on patterns of response	1.75	2.00	2.38
7	Teacher chose observational strategies	1.88	3.00	1.77
8	Recorded impressions about classroom	2.25	2.33	2.20
19	Recorded student/teacher interactions	1.88	2.66	2.33
16	Recorded data on student movement	2.50	2.33	2.53
9	Made notes of classroom dialogue	2.50	2.33	2.53
15	Recorded data on teacher movement	2.35	2.66	2.50
6	Suggested observational techniques	2.17	3.00	2.00
18	Recorded data on specific student	3.00	2.66	2.93
17	Made video recordings	2.69	3.33	3.14
14	Made audio recordings	2.88	3.33	2.97

*I = Mean score of ratings by experts in improvement of instruction; P = Mean score of ratings by experts in due process; T = Mean score of teacher ratings

Items rated as "essential" have a mean score between 1.00 and 1.75

essence the improvement of instruction criteria would require that the due process criteria be met, and: (i) a preconference must be held to discover what the teacher expected the students to be doing, and to discern what problems or concerns the teacher had, (ii) during the post conference, greater teacher input should be sought and appropriate praise and encouragement given, and (iii) a formal appeal procedure should be available if the teacher challenged the report.

10. The sixteen items identified as essential by teachers (Table 4) form a subset of the improvement of instruction items. The most notable differences fell in the areas related to the establishment of standards and the collection of objective data. Teachers rated these items lower than either of the groups of experts, and no objective data collection strategies were rated as essential by teachers. In addition, teachers rated teacher input items higher than either group of experts.

11. The patterns of "yes" responses to the 37 items on the Modified Acheson/Shinn instrument (Table 5) were somewhat similar for superintendents, other central office staff, and principals; however, noteworthy differences occurred on ten items:

Less than half the superintendents, but more than three quarters of other central office staff and principals met with the teacher prior to the classroom observation (Item 3).

TABLE 5. Comparative Ranking of "Yes" Responses to Items on the Acheson/Shinn Instrument

Item #	Descriptor	Rank A*	S	O	P
25	Met with teacher after observation	1	1	1.5	1
20	Observed for at least 30 minutes	2	2	1.5	4
35	Teacher received a copy of report	3	5	4.5	2
30	Gave praise and encouragement	4	10	7	3
19	Recorded student/teacher interactions	5.5	3	10.5	8
24	Examined student work	5.5	5	4.5	11
8	Recorded impressions about classroom	7	5	4.5	12
12	Recorded data on on-task behavior	8.5	12	8	9.5
27	Encouraged teacher inferences & opinions	8.5	14.5	9	6
37	Appeal procedure available	10	19	12.5	5
36	Teacher could respond in writing	11	14.5	14	7
5	Found teacher concerns	12	8	10.5	13.5
4	Found teacher expectations of students	13	13	15	13.5
21	Examined teacher's planbook	14	7	4.5	16
26	Solicited teacher analysis of data	15	17.5	16	15
3	Met prior to observation	16	25	20.5	9.5
32	Developed recommendations	17	10	12.5	18.5
28	Encouraged consideration of alternatives	18	17.5	17.5	17
11	Recorded data on student responses	19	20	19	18.5
22	Compared with Alberta Program of Studies	20	16	22	22
10	Recorded data on teacher questions	21	21.5	17.5	21
23	Examined record of student achievement	22	10	20.5	26
33	Developed recommendations with teacher	23	27	25	20
2	Standards of performance developed	24	24	26	23
9	Made notes of classroom dialogue	25	21.5	23	24
13	Recorded data on patterns of response	26	33	21	35
18	Recorded data on specific student	27	26	24	27
15	Recorded data on teacher movement	28	28	28	28.5
16	Recorded data on student movement	29	29	29	28.5
1	Had written job description	30	30.5	30	31
31	Recommended resources	31	30.5	27	33
29	Listened more than I talked	32	34	33	30
34	Developed a plan of assistance	33	32	32	35
7	Teacher chose observational strategies	34	35	34	32
6	Suggested observational techniques	35	33	35	34
14	Made audio recordings	36	36	36.5	36
17	Made video recordings	37	37	36.5	37

Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients:
S:O r = .94; $p < .01$
S:P r = .84; $p < .01$
O:P r = .90; $p < .01$

* A = All respondents; S = Superintendents; O = Other Central Office Staff; P = Principals

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An appeal procedure (Item 37) was more likely to be made available when the evaluation was carried out by a principal (91.5%), than when carried out by other central office staff (87.7%), or superintendents (69%).

Superintendents and other central office staff were more likely than principals to record student/teacher interactions (Item 19), record impressions about the classroom (Item 8), examine students' work (Item 24), and examine the teacher's planbook (Item 21). In addition, superintendents placed a greater emphasis upon the examination of the record of student achievement (Item 23).

Principals, more than other central office staff, and superintendents: encouraged teacher input in the post observation conference (Item 27), gave praise and encouragement (Item 30), and provided the opportunity for the teacher to respond to the report in writing (Item 36).

Superintendents developed recommendations to help the teacher improve instruction (Item 32) more frequently than other central office staff or principals.

12. Few of the respondents met the minimum criteria to assure due process (4.5%), and fewer met the criteria for the improvement of instruction (1.3%). Essential due process items not used in the last evaluation by more than 50% of respondents were:

Item 34, the development of a plan of assistance (superintendents, other central office staff, and

principals).

Item 31, the recommendation of resources (superintendents and principals).

Item 23, the examination of the record of student achievement (principals).

Item 33, the development of recommendations in cooperation with the teacher (superintendents).

The items essential for the improvement of instruction that were not used by more than 50% of respondents included Items 34, 31, and 33 as noted above and:

Item 29, I listened more than I talked (superintendents, other central office staff, and principals).

Item 3, I met with the teacher prior to the observation (superintendents).

Twenty nine (8.3%) of the respondents met the minimum criteria established in the teacher perception subset. The items deemed essential by teachers that were not used by more than 50% of respondents were Items 34, 31, 33, and 3 as noted above.

Conclusions and Implications

Demographic Factors

The demographic factors that relate to the respondents and that are positively correlated with a significantly more complete evaluation are: the placing of a high priority on

teacher evaluation, and high levels of university training. In addition, a positive correlation exists between these two factors.

Experience (except in the case of superintendents where there was a statistically significant negative correlation), the amount of inservice training, the number of teachers supervised and the adequacy of the time available for teacher evaluation were not significantly related to completeness.

This implies that, in the selection of personnel who will have a major responsibility in the area of teacher evaluation, the primary criteria should include those related to a commitment to teacher evaluation and adequate related university training.

Inservice Training

The lack of a significant relationship between inservice training and the completeness of the evaluation is almost certainly due to the model of inservice training commonly in use in Alberta, namely the "single shot," one or two day lecture or workshop. Studies by Joyce and Showers (1981) indicate that, for inservice training to cause a change in behavior, five training elements are essential: theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching. The "single shot" strategy can, at best, encompass the first four of these components. This, say Joyce and Showers, can

result in a transfer effect of up to 10% at the classroom level. To achieve a substantial effect, all five elements, used in sequence are required. When this is done, a 90% transfer effect can be achieved.

The potential for the successful implementation of this model in Alberta is demonstrated by the positive outcomes reported in Townsend's (1984) study of the implementation of a policy on teacher evaluation in the Lethbridge School District # 51.

The implications of the present lack of a relationship between inservice training and completeness of evaluation, the Joyce and Showers (1981) research, and the Townsend (1984) study are far reaching. They suggest that, if a change in the evaluative behavior of superintendents, other central office staff, and principals is to be effected, the whole process of inservice training in Alberta should be restructured.

Policy

This study found no relationship between the presence of a written policy on formal teacher evaluation and the completeness of the last evaluation, nor was the level of adherence to policy significantly related to completeness; however, routine evaluations, initiated in accordance with board policy tended to be more complete than those not initiated for this reason. This suggests that school board

policies may serve no useful purpose, except to initiate teacher evaluation.

In the prefatory stages of this study in 1983, the researcher collected and examined the teacher evaluation policies from the majority of Alberta school jurisdictions and encountered an incredible diversity of policies. They ranged from complex policies that incorporated clearly delineated strategies and instruments, to brief statements of intent; from policies clearly designed to assure due process, to policies that obviously contravened recent human rights legislation. This informal survey confirmed Reikie's (1977, p. v) statement that:

> Overall, there were few school systems with clearly structured evaluation policies and practices. Numerous jurisdictions appeared to have no policies regarding many facets of teacher evaluations. Among the jurisdictions there was a wide variety of practices. Few practices were found to be consistent across Alberta.

The absence of a relationship between policy and the completeness of teacher evaluation, and the documented lack of consistency of teacher evaluation policies across the province suggests that the development of teacher evaluation policies at the local board level may be an ineffective mechanism for the implementation of teacher evaluation practices across the province.

The State of Oregon, U.S.A., has adopted a statewide model which prescribes a basic form of teacher evaluation, consistent with the clinical supervision model, yet leaves

local boards considerable autonomy within its basic guidelines. That model is delineated in Oregon Revised Statute 342.850:

> Teacher evaluation; form; personnel file content. (1) The district superintendent of every school district, including superintendents of education service districts, shall cause to have made at least annually but with multiple observations an evaluation of performance for each probationary teacher employed by the district and at least biennially for every other teacher. The purpose of the evaluation is to allow the teacher and the district to determine the teacher's development and growth in the teaching profession and to evaluate the performance of the teaching responsibilities. A form for teacher evaluation shall be prescribed by the State Board of Education and completed pursuant to rules adopted by the district school board.
> (2) (a) The district school board shall develop an evaluation process in consultation with school administrators and with teachers. If a school district's teachers are represented by a local bargaining organization, the board shall consult with the teachers belonging to and appointed by the local bargaining organization in the consultation required by this paragraph.
> (b) The district school board shall implement the evaluation process that includes:
> (A) The establishment of job descriptions and performance standards which include but are not limited to items included in the job description;
> (B) A preevaluation interview which includes but is not limited to the establishment of performance goals for the teacher, based on the job description and performance standards;
> (C) An evaluation based on written criteria which include the performance goals; and
> (D) A post-evaluation interview in which (i) the results of the evaluation are discussed with the teacher and (ii) a written program of assistance for improvement, if needed, is established.
> (c) Nothing in this subsection is intended to prevent a district from consulting with any other individuals.
> (3) Except in those districts having an average daily membership, as defined by ORS 327.006, of fewer than 200 students, the person or persons making the evaluations must hold teaching certificates. The evaluation shall be signed by the school official who supervised the teacher. A copy of the evaluation shall

be delivered to the teacher.
(4) The evaluation reports shall be maintained in the personnel files of the district.
(5) The evaluation report shall be placed in the teacher's file only after reasonable notice to the teacher.
(6) A teacher may make a written statement relating to any evaluation, reprimand, charge, action or any matter placed in the teacher's personnel file and such teacher's statement shall be placed in the personnel file.
(7) The personnel file shall be open for inspection by the teacher, the teacher's designees and the district school board and its designees. District school boards shall adopt rules governing access to personnel files, including rules specifying whom school officials may designate to inspect personnel files.

Minimum Criteria for Satisfactory Evaluation

As the findings of this study show, few respondents met the minimum criteria deemed necessary to assure due process or the improvement of instruction in formal teacher evaluation. The picture, however, is not as bleak as it first may seem, since the findings also reveal that, on average, evaluators carried out almost three quarters of the strategies necessary to meet those requirements, and repeating patterns were found in the items commonly omitted. This suggests that with appropriate training, most evaluator performance could be readily upgraded to meet the minimum criteria.

The strategies deemed essential by teachers differed from those of experts in that teachers gave lower rankings to items related to the establishment of standards and the collection of objective data. This suggests that teachers

are anxious about evaluation and particularly those processes which are essential in termination cases, namely the due process items. The findings of this study suggest that the great majority of formal evaluations carried out are positive, rather than punitive in intent, and that the apparent fears exhibited by teachers are generally groundless. However, it would be folly to dismiss those fears, since, if one of the primary purposes of evaluation is to improve instruction, a negative perception of some of the essential processes could seriously inhibit the successful implementation of any useful program of evaluation.

Recommendations

As a result of the findings of this study, and the conclusions drawn therefrom, it is recommended that:

1. When engaging personnel whose major responsibility will be the evaluation of teachers, school boards hire persons who place a high priority upon teacher evaluation and who have appropriate related university training.

2. When organizing inservice training to upgrade evaluators in their jurisdictions, school boards ensure that the model of inservice training used is one that results in a change in behavior at the classroom level, namely, one that includes theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching.

3. That school boards involve classroom teachers in those inservice programs so that they become more knowledgeable, and more committed to the processes of formal evaluation.

4. The Government of Alberta enact legislation to ensure that teacher evaluation is carried out in a fair and consistent manner throughout the province.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study has described the formal teacher evaluation practices in Alberta during the period September 1, 1983 to April 30, 1984, as reported by superintendents, other central office staff, and principals. In addition, it has assessed the adequacy of the current evaluative practices with respect to minimum criteria in the areas of due process and the improvement of instruction, and explored the relationships between the completeness of the evaluation and demographic factors.

One limitation of this study is that it has described the current evaluative practices using data collected from the evaluators, not from those being evaluated. Other studies (e.g. Shinn, 1976) suggest that the perceptions of teachers and administrators may be different and so future studies might examine the teacher perspective in more depth.

Data collected in this study showed that teachers did not rate the establishment of standards of performance and

objective data collection techniques as highly as did experts in due process and improvement of instruction. Future studies might focus on the reasons for this difference and the impact of inservice training upon teacher perceptions.

Joyce and Showers (1981) have demonstrated the need for a model of inservice training that includes theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching. They suggest that the transfer of knowledge into actual classroom practice occurs when all of these components are used in sequence. Future studies could explore the impact of this inservice model in improving the quality of teacher evaluation in Alberta.

The review of the literature revealed that, early in this century, researchers discovered that the evaluation of teachers had a dramatic effect on student outcomes. No recent studies were found describing the relationship between modern teacher evaluation strategies and student performance. Future studies might examine the differences between the performance of students in classrooms where the teachers are evaluated, as opposed to those where no teacher evaluation takes place.

REFERENCES

Acheson, K. A. (1982). Evaluation of teachers. Salem, OR: Conference of Oregon School Administrators.

Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (1980). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers. New York: Longman.

Amidon, E., & Flanders, N. (1963). The role of the teacher in the classroom: A manual for understanding and improving teacher's classroom behavior. Minneapolis: Paul Amidon and Associates.

Barr, A. S., Burton, W. H., & Brueckner, L. J. (1938). Supervision: Principles and practices in the improvement of instruction (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century.

Berliner, D. C. (1982). Using research on teaching for the improvement of classroom practice. Theory into Practice, 19, 303-308.

Burton, W. H. (1922). Supervision and the improvement of teaching. New York: Appleton.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hersh, R. (1981). What makes some schools and teachers more effective. Draft paper. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1981). Transfer of training: The contribution of coaching. Boston University Journal of Education.

Keegstra v. County of Lacombe. (1983). Appeal to the Board of Reference. Judicial District of Edmonton. Edmonton, Alberta.

Lucio, W. H., & McNeil, J. D. (1962). Supervision: A synthesis of thought and action. New York: McGraw Hill.

Manatt, R. P., Palmer, K. L., & Hidlebaugh, F. (1976). Evaluating teacher performance with improved rating scales. NASSP Bulletin, 60(401), 21-23.

Medley, D. M., & Crook, P. R. (1982). Research in teacher competency and teaching tasks. Theory into Practice, 19, 294-301.

Redfern, G. B. (1980). Evaluating teachers and administrators: A performance objectives approach. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Shinn, J. (1977). Teacher perceptions of ideal and actual supervisory procedures used by California elementary principals: The effects of supervisory programs sponsored by the Association of California School Administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Oregon.

Townsend, D. (in press). The first year of implementation of a policy of teacher supervision and evaluation in the five secondary schools of Lethbridge School District No. 51. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Education.